

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. Claims 1-19 have been rejected. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 9-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by Alwang, which is a printed publication, PC Magazine, dated February 10, 1998.

The Examiner asserts that Alwang discloses a method directed to:

maintaining a record of information for determining the approach of task due dates for a plurality of client entities; maintaining hypermedia server means for receiving task performance instructions, at a plurality of times sending an electronic message to each client entity for which a task due date falls within a succeeding predetermined period, receiving an instruction to perform a task from a client entity by means of the hypermedia server means, wherein said electronic messages include means for causing a client entity to request a page from the hypermedia server means. (pages 5 to 11)

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 1 and 7 recite, inter alia,

sending an electronic message to each client entity for which a task due date falls within a succeeding predetermined period; and

receiving an instruction to perform a task from a client entity by means of the hypermedia server means, **wherein said electronic messages include means for causing a client entity to request a page from the hypermedia server means.**

Claims 1 and 7 cover an improved apparatus and method of sending emails which puts a limit on the number of reminder email that a person will receive. Generally, a

reminder for a particular due date is sent X days/hour etc. before the event. As a result, the user will receive 5 emails together if there are 5 events with the same due date.

Further, there are certain predetermined times when reminders may be sent, e.g. every Monday. Whether an email is sent to a user on any given Monday, in this case, is determined on the basis of whether that user has any due dates in the next X days/weeks/months etc. Thus, in this case, the user will receive a maximum of one reminder email per week, on a Monday, irrespective of the number of due dates the user needs to be reminded of. (See for example, Figs. 7-9 of the present application.)

Alwang discloses, 'A reminder utility lets you send e-mail messages at preset intervals, ...'. The electronic messages can result from a programmed event software routine for the purposes of implementing an undefined reminder function.

However, Alwang does not disclose that these reminders are triggered "for which a task due date falls within a succeeding predetermined period," nor does Alwang disclose that these reminders "include means for causing a client entity to request a page from the hypermedia server means," as claimed in claims 1 and 7.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 7 are not anticipated by Alwang. Since claims 3-5 depend from claim 1 and claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 7. The dependent claims include the patentable elements of claims 1 and 7. Therefore they are not anticipated by Alwang for the same reasons given for claims 1 and 7.

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2, 6, 8, 11-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alwang.

Regarding independent claims 11 and 16, the Examiner states:

"recites the same limitations of claim 1 above, except a page identifier and loading the page identifier into browser of the client computer. However, it is old and well known to incorporate a page identifier when displaying transmitting and displaying a page to a user's computer for proper indexing purposes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art to incorporate a page identifier into the disclosure of Alwang for allowing easy retrieval of the page."

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Since Alwang does not teach or suggest at least the elements of claim 1 cited above, and moreover, Alwang provides no teaching or suggestion to incorporate a page identifier in the e-mail messages being sent at preset intervals nor does it suggest automatically including anything in its e-mail messages. Thus, Claims 2, 6, 8, 11-19 are not unpatentable over Alwang under § 103(a). Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims as herein presented are allowable over the prior art of record, taken alone or in combination, and that the respective rejections be withdrawn. Applicant further submits that the application is hereby placed in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____



Frank Chau
Reg. No. 34,136
Attorney for Applicant

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Rd.
Woodbury, New York 11797
Tel: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889

FC/DM:sg